

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over the Barnett reference and the Vana reference. In that regard, claim 1 recites means for displacing one of the side surfaces toward the other side surface. The Barnett reference has no such expedient and it appears that the corresponding side surfaces in Barnett would be too rigid to be displaced.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the side surfaces of the insert seat diverge in a direction away from the slot. That feature is not disclosed by Vana; in fact, that feature is the same as disclosed in now-canceled claim 10 which was not rejected over Vana.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 distinguishes patentably over Barnett and Vana.

Independent claim 12 has been amended to recite that the side surfaces diverge in a direction away from the slot and thus distinguishes patentably over Vana as noted above.


Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite that the slot has a width smaller than a largest width of the eat. That feature was taken from original claim 11 which was not rejected over Vana. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 14 distinguishes patentably over the Vana reference.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, LLP

By



Alan E. Kopecki

Registration No. 25,813

Post Office Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: February 18, 2004